



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,570	11/19/2001	Manfred Bartz	CYPR-CD01167M	1199

7590 04/16/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET, THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

DIMYAN, MAGID Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2825

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,570	11/19/2001	Manfred Bartz	CYPR-CD01167M	1199

7590 03/05/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Thrid Floor
Two North Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

DIMYAN, MAGID Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2825

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/989,570

Applicant(s)

BARTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Magid Y Dimyan

Art Unit

2825

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Magid Y Dimyan.

(3) Anthony C. Murabito.

(2) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 February 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The preliminary amendment sent by the applicants and filed February 19, 2003 was found not to be a bona fide response to the First Office Action filed January 2, 2003. Thus, the applicants only have the remainder of the time supplied by the USPTO as per MPEP 714.03. The three month time period ends on April 2, 2003.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)


i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MATTHEW SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required